

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 96-2367**

---

JOHN B. KIMBLE, on behalf of Citizens of the  
State of Maryland,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

PEDRO RODRIGUEZ, Officer; DAVID GILLESPIE,  
Officer; DANIEL GRIFFITH, Officer; THOMAS  
HEENEY; JAMES L. PARSONS, Assistant County  
Attorney; VERA WHITE, Assistant State's Attor-  
ney; MARGARET BURROWES, Assistant State's  
Attorney; HENRY J. MONAHAN, Judge; MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY POLICE; MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT;  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE; OFFICE  
OF COUNTY ATTORNEY; STATE'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE;  
STATE OF MARYLAND,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge.  
(CA-96-733-AW)

---

Submitted: December 19, 1996

Decided: December 30, 1996

---

Before ERVIN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit  
Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

---

John B. Kimble, Appellant Pro Se. Linda B. Thall, Senior Assistant County Attorney, Sharon Veronica Burrell, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Rockville, Maryland; Thomas Louis Heeney, HEENEY, ARMSTRONG & HEENEY, Rockville, Maryland; Lawrence Paul Fletcher-Hill, Assistant Attorney General, Margaret Witherup Tindall, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's order denying class certification, granting some Defendants' motions to dismiss, and giving Appellant fifteen days to file an amended complaint. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the order is not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order here appealed is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See Jung v. K. & D. Mining Co., 356 U.S. 335, 337 (1958).

We dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED